

Mr. SPEAKER.—Supposing a Bill is prepared and introduced on the 15th June or any other date subsequently. Then you will have no chance to give your valuable suggestions. It is better for the Government to consider the views of the members and frame a Bill.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—May I suggest a remedy? Let us discuss the Report for two days and if you feel that discussion should be continued in the next session, that may also be done.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—In any event, there should be a debate. It may once for all be taken up in June. Because this is a voluminous report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a matter for the House to decide. You must also consider the other aspect.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Very well, I accept the suggestion. To-day I will not be able to state exactly as to when we should adjourn, either on the 10th or earlier. Of course, the debate on the educational reforms will be postponed to the adjourned session and the Government may have some piece of work to be transacted now alone. I will be able to definitely give the Government point of view tomorrow morning as to when exactly we should adjourn.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—In any event, we will be relieved on Saturday the 11th.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is understood in any event that discussion on the educational reforms will be taken up on the 15th June and onwards. Does the House agree to this?

SEVERAL MEMBERS.—Yes.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to know whether interpellations and resolutions could be sent for the adjourned session commencing on the 15th June.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, unless the Speaker uses his discretion.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I am submitting to the Speaker whether he would be kind enough to permit us to send interpellations and resolutions for the adjourned session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will inform the House tomorrow. I understand yesterday evening Resolution No. 15 was under discussion. My friend Sri S. M. Mariyappa had his say. If any Hon'ble Member is anxious to speak about this Resolution, he may do so.

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS— RESOLUTIONS.

No. 15. *Removal of Prohibition—* (continued).

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Yesterday, the suggestion was that all those members who have sent in allied resolutions may take part in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suggested that also. In fact resolution Nos. 25, 35, 37, 38 and this resolution No. 15—all these may be taken up together.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Shall we move our resolutions also?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not necessary.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN (Ulsoor).—Sir, have I to move my resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No member who has sent in a resolution on this subject need move his resolution. If he so desires, he may speak on this resolution.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I am supporting the resolution moved by my friend Mr. Swamidurai. In this connection I have also tabled a resolution to the effect that the present policy of prohibition may be revised.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—Yesterday, you wanted to give priority to Bangalore District for prohibition.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That was under some other situation. Your Chief Minister wanted to make Chitaldrug wet.

Sir, this drink habit is considered as an evil from time immemorial. It is a social evil for the eradication of which persistent and serious attempts have been made and are being made. There are no two opinions regarding the fact that this social evil must disappear from society. Attempts were made not only in India, but in various other countries to tackle this problem.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Koratagere- Madhugiri— Scheduled Castes).—Pakistan has introduced prohibition.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.— Is it so ?

But the difficulty is, by what means this laudable object should be achieved and what are the steps to be taken. If on account of the steps we take, we achieve the desired objective, nobody will be happier than we are. But doubts are always entertained regarding the steps you have to take for a successful implementation of this policy. Sir, I may go a little back in the history of Mysore as to the steps adopted to control and minimise this evil.

Sir, since the year 1920, the then Government of Mysore adopted certain steps to minimise this evil and in my opinion there are two recognised ways by which this object can be effected. One is by total prohibition and secondly by regulation and by control. The Government of Mysore adopted the latter method of introducing a series of controls and control measures to check this evil. In pursuance of that policy they took certain steps which are as follows: They enhanced the duty on various alcoholic liquors. They reduced the strength of liquor. They reduced the number of shops. They regulated the time during which the issue was to be made to the consumers and they adopted various measures and also tried territorial prohibition in certain taluks as an experimental measure. On account of these steps undertaken by the Government of Mysore and according to the figures available,

there was a remarkable decrease not only in the number of consumers, but in the amount of the drugs consumed and I may state that these are authoritative figures for the information of this House.

In the year 1917-18, the consumption of arrack was 4,00,055 gallons per year. In the year 1940-41, the consumption of arrack went down to 1,38,000 gallons. So there was remarkable decrease. Similarly, regarding the consumption of toddy, the number of toddy trees licensed for tapping was 4,68,000 in 1917-18 and went down in the year 1940-41 to 2,21,000. Similarly there has been a decrease in consumption of other drinks like opium, ganja, etc. So it can be taken for granted according to these official figures—that on account of these steps adopted by the Government of Mysore, there was decrease in consumption. But, this would not satisfy the then public opinion. They wanted that the entire evil should be eradicated and rooted out. Meanwhile, the neighbouring State of Madras adopted a system of prohibition which is now existing. This gave impetus to the demand for territorial introduction of prohibition, to introduce wholesale prohibition according to territorial basis similarly. A committee was constituted and that committee after examining all the aspects gave a scheme which was adopted by the Government of Mysore for only one year. They went into all aspects but that committee did not recommend the introduction of prohibition in a territorial order and the reasons given therein are these :

“The Committee have devoted the most careful consideration to the methods to be adopted for successfully implementing the policy of prohibition in the State. Prohibition is still in an experimental stage. Several countries tried the experiment with varying results. The United States of America tried the experiment of prohibition on a local and

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

national scale for a number of years but ultimately abandoned it; similarly Finland, Russia and Norway. In India, the State of Bhopal tried the experiment for six years and gave it up."

Similarly Madras introduced prohibition in the year 1937 and after two years, this territorial prohibition was given up.

"The system of introducing prohibition in some territorial order has been tried elsewhere and the results have not been very encouraging. It is no doubt true that this method of prohibition looks spectacular as some areas suddenly become dry, but the Committee feel doubtful of its ultimate success. Its main defects are that while one or two districts in the State go dry, the remaining portions and the addicts living therein are allowed to continue their habit without any check or control. In the districts where prohibition is introduced, there is a sudden and violent change which might lead to undesirable consequences. Human nature being what it is, it seems unlikely that a man's craving could be curbed suddenly, whereas it might be possible to do so gradually. Sudden deprivation might make the addicts desperate and drive them to resort to illicit means of securing the intoxicants."

On account of these reasons, the committee did not recommend the introduction of prohibition in a territorial order. On the other hand the scheme recommended by the committee was this:

"Reduction in the number of excise shops in the State at a progressive rate of 20 per cent each year followed by a corresponding reduction in the issue of arrack, toddy and other intoxicants including foreign liquors and

in the number of toddy trees licensed for tapping."

So, the committee recommended a sort of regulation and control for the first five years so that at the end of five years, we may watch the experiment and take final steps. But when the Congress Government came into power they set aside the recommendations of the committee and introduced prohibition on a territorial basis. They introduced first in three districts—in the districts of Chitaldrug, Tumkur and Kolar and then they extended it to two other districts, Shimoga and Chikmagalur and there was a fullstop. There was no further

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was further extended to Saklespur and Belur.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—It was further extended to Ramanagaram and Chennapatna also.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I stand modified, Sir. There has been no further extension. Now, Sir, we have to consider dispassionately whether the steps we have taken so far have proved successful and whether they have benefited the people and whether they have benefited the society. In all such measures, you must take a dispassionate view and not consider it as a party issue. If all of us think that the measures so far adopted have really benefited the people, have really helped in the progress of the people and have helped in their economic uplift, then I am one with you in upholding the policy of prohibition. On the other hand, if you are convinced that the present system is injurious to society, then I think, you must adopt and revise your policy and adopt some other measures. I am not for uncontrolled licence and freedom being given to the consumers. But what we should consider is—what are the other steps we must adopt to minimise drinking, to control drinking. In the present system I may state without fear of contradiction that society has suffered a good deal. The greatest difficulty is

that it has given room to a large and widespread manufacture of illicit liquor. Manufacture of illicit liquor has been going on to a large extent and the Police or the Government—though it may be in spite of their best efforts—have not been able to control it or to check it. It is common knowledge and I can say that in that particular area, villagers have become positively wet and over wet. What is more, Sir, the stuff that they have been manufacturing is proved positively injurious and dangerous to the people. Before prohibition was introduced, the consumer was getting healthy stuff, a stuff which was regulated and which was under control. But now, by illicit manufacture, drink has become very injurious and it is my personal knowledge that many people have lost their health and even their lives.

1-30 P.M.

I must state that paradoxically it seems to me that the number of consumers has increased. Before prohibition was introduced, perhaps one person was addicted to drink in one house. Now it is a common saying, not without foundation, that in every house every adult and even children have taken to drink because it is very freely available, because it is very easily available. Formerly he had to walk up to the arrack shop or toddy shop to drink but now it is available in the neighbouring house. Formerly this drink evil was confined to a few communities. Now I must say from my personal knowledge that it is going on extending from community to community.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps if the recommendations of your committee had been implemented this would not have happened.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—If you ask my personal opinion, Sir, it is a social evil, and I think legislation cannot be invoked to eradicate a social evil. We have so many social evils in society and all these social

evils should be eradicated through education, through propaganda and they must be eradicated voluntarily. Any sort of compulsion through legislation will not have the desired effect. We may have any number of laws. The greater the number of laws, the lesser the effect. If you ask my personal opinion, I want that Government should not interfere in all these social matters or in eradicating social evils. It must be left to the society. There was a temperance movement. They were doing very good work. It is only through education, through training, through tradition, that you can eradicate all these evils.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even now they have made a provision of Rs. 2,000.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—For temperance? This is the result.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Why did you recommend introduction of gradual prohibition?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—To satisfy you. (*Laughter*).

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Are you going back on your own recommendation?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am not going back.

Another curious phenomenon existing in our State is this. If prohibition had been introduced through the entire State, then we could have watched the effect. But the very fact that half the State is wet and half the State is dry and the fact that there is no likelihood of extending prohibition into the dry areas in the near future must make us think whether there is need to revise our policy. This is a sort of discrimination. I think discrimination is prohibited under the Constitution.

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN (Ulsoor).—File a writ in the High Court.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is the order of the day. People living in half the area of the State are discriminated from the people living in the other half. This is a constitutional matter and it is worth while to consider whether such discrimination can be allowed or intro-

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

duced in the State. You have freely allowed and encouraged drinks in half the area while you penalise and send people to jail if they committed a similar act in another half. This is absolutely discrimination and it is open for consideration and Government should think whether such a thing could be introduced and whether it is not against the Constitution. Six years have passed and this is the result. The public are not satisfied and we are not satisfied. We should not be guided by sentiment. So, I submit that time has come when Government must seriously consider what should be their future policy and what steps they must adopt in future. If you ask my own opinion

.....

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Is it your opinion or the opinion of Praja Socialist Party?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—You forget that I am the Leader. (*Laughter.*) I am encouraged to make this statement by the results achieved by the previous Government. I just now showed to you by facts and figures that on account of the policy adopted by the previous Government, the consumption went down. It cannot be denied. I have collected those figures and I am of opinion that if the same old policy is adopted hereafter we may attain a certain amount of success in eradicating this evil. What should be done is this. We must also get a substantial revenue to the State and also we must see that the common man or the people who are addicted to drink do not get their drinks, or alcoholic liquors very easily. That is the system of taxation adopted in other countries and it has proved very successful. For example, I was in England. There the taxes levied on cigarettes, on alcoholic liquors, and on luxury goods are enormous, nearly two hundred per cent, so much so that they are not within the reach of an ordinary man. Very few people will

indulge in excessive drinking. Again we can regulate the number of shops. You can go on increasing and decreasing the number of shops and also enhancing the prices of consumable articles. It is only such methods that will make it hard for the consumer to have his drinks whenever he wants. That will have the desired effect and this evil can be eradicated to a certain extent. I can tell you that as far as the levy of duty and enhancement of duty on liquors is concerned, we will not be against it. It is a necessary measure intended to eradicate this evil. In all such measures Government may expect our co-operation. So, instead of going into the details, I submit to the Government that time has come to investigate how far the present policy of prohibition has worked—whether it has proved successful or not. And it is also their duty to appoint a Committee, if necessary, and let them make enquiries; let them take all aspects into consideration and if it is indeed necessary for the good of the country, let them revise their policy.

With these observations, I support the resolution moved by Sri Swamidurai.

Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS (Nominated).—Sir, I rise in support of the resolution now before the house. The previous speakers have dealt exhaustively on the evils of prohibition. In doing so, they have stolen all my thunder, and left me bereft of powder and shot, and I have, perforce, to be very brief in my observations.

I was at one time an ardent advocate of prohibition, because I felt that in its wake there would be ushered in an era of economic prosperity for the masses. But I was disillusioned, badly, bitterly disillusioned. Economic prosperity followed, no doubt, but only for a very small section of the people who had taken to illicit distillation. As my friend, Sri Swamidurai mentioned yesterday, “illicit distillation had become a cottage industry”—it has further been facetiously remarked that in Kolar Gold Field

illicit distillation threatens to displace gold mining as the first industry! With illicit distillation has crept in a certain amount of moral turpitude and social degradation. Wherever one goes there is noticed a subtle defiance of the prohibition law, and I may admit that at times I have been an offender in this respect.

I was also of the opinion that it would be the future generations which would derive the fruits of the present policy. But here again I am disappointed. Grown up children have not only learnt the art of illicit distillation but are increasingly taking to the consumption of illicit intoxicant liquor. I do not wish to dilate on the evils of prohibition because Hon'ble Members of this House are as well acquainted with facts as I am.

Sir, I have no political irons in the fire, when I sincerely advise the Government to scrap, at least for the present, the prohibition laws. We may re-introduce prohibition only after we have created the correct psychological background.

I know that such a step requires courage and wisdom, but the present Government has shown that they are not lacking in these attributes when tackling other problems. I know Government will be criticised in some quarters, but on the whole I feel that the measure will be generally welcomed throughout the State. It would not only add to the somewhat inelastic revenues of the State, but it would tend to improve the social and moral background in those areas where prohibition is now in force. That is all I have to say, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri K. S. Vasan has sent a similar resolution. He is not here. All the three residents of K.G.F. have sent similar resolutions. There are four members who have sent up resolutions as opposed to these resolutions. They are Sri B. N. Boranna Gowda, Sri D. R. Kari Gowda, Sri S. M. Mariappa and Sri M. V. Rama Rao. Any one of them may speak.

(The Hon'ble Members were not present.)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ).—ವಜ್ರಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ, ಈ ಠಾಣವನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಂತಿಮವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯೇನೆ.

ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ನಡೆದ ಸಾಮೂಹಿಕ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತ ಈ ಪಾನ ವಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸದ್ಭಾವೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿಗೂ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭರವಸೆಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿರಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ಚನ್ನಗಿರಿ).—ಹೌದು. ನಾವೇನೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ನಿಜವಾದ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಾತ್ ತಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಈ ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೂ ಸಹ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಂದು ವಿರೋಧ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದರೆ ಯೇ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗದ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹಾಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುವ ಧೈರ್ಯ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಬಡವನಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಿಗೆ, ಆ ಬಡವನಿಂದ ತಾವು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರು ಎಂದು ಹೊಗಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರೇ ಆದರೆ ಆಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಹೊಗಳಿಸುವವರೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ತಾವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯವರಾಗಿ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ನಡತೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ, ಇತರರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡಕರಾಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ಆಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ತಳ್ಳಲು, ಅವರು ಕೀಳು, ನಾವು ಮೇಲು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವದಿಂದ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ಪಾನವಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಜನರು ಈ ದಿವಸ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಾಲಸೋಲಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಮನೆ, ಜಮೀನು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಗಂಡ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಗ ಗಮನಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ದೇಶದ ಹಲ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಏನೊಂದು 'ಇಲ್ಲಿನಿಟ್ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂಟ್ಡ್' ತಯಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಕುಡಿಯುವ ಸ್ವಭಾವದ ಜನಗಳು ಬಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಈಗ ಕುಡಿಯುವುದನ್ನೇ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾರು ಈ ದಿವಸ ತಯಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರು ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ಹಣ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಯ ಗುರಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಆದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ತಯಾರಿಸುವವರ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿ, ಸಮಯಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರಪರಾಧಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪಶೆಟ್ಟಿ)

ಗೌಡ ಜನರು ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯಾರು ಮೋಟಾರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಜಟಕಾಗಾಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ವ್ಯಾನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಚಪ್ಪಲಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅದನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸುವಂತೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಪುನರಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ತಾವು ಬಳ್ಳಿಯವರಹಾಗೆ ತಲೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ದೇಶದೊಳಗೆ ಗಳೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈಗ ಕರೆದರೂ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಈ ಕುಡಿತವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಕಾನೂನುಬಾಹಿರ ಮಾಡಲು ಆಯಾ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ತಕ್ಕ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಕುಡಿತದ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸವಿರಬಾರದು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರಲ್ಲಿ ನುಮಾರು ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲುಮೂರು ವಿಸೇ ಕುಡುಕರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು.

ಕುಡುಕರನ್ನು ಹುಡುಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ ಎಂದು ಕುಡಿಯುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಹುಡುಕಲೆಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವವರು ತಮಗೇ ಕುಡಿಯಲೆಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಉತ್ತೇಜನಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹೊರತು, ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ವರ್ತನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿದ ಹೊರತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನೇಮಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಜನರ ನೆತನದಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮೊದಲು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಡಿತವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ನಾನು ಕುಡಿತದ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕುಡಿತ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪರದೇಶಗಳ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕರು ಕುಡುಕತನದಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ನೀತಿಯ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಪರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ 24 ಗಂಟೆಗಳೂ ಕುಡಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿದ್ದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದೊಂದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಯೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೂ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷ ಆಸಕ್ತಿವಹಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಪರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಆ ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕರಾಪಕರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋದರೂ ಕೆಲವು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸಕ್ತಿವಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಟೀಕಿಸುವ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಾಗಲಿ, ಪ್ರಜಾಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಕಾಣಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕುಡುಕತನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿದ್ದು ರವಿಸುವುದು ಒಂದೆನಿಸಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯೋಚನೆಯೇ ಹೊಳೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯ ಉನ್ನತ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ಭಾರತೀಯ ಧರ್ಮ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಸರ್ವ ಧರ್ಮಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಮೇರೆಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತನ್ನ ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನು ಹರಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಾರು ಇಸ್ಲಾಂ ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿಹಿಡಿದು, ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ

ಪಾದಿಸುವುದು ಇಸ್ಲಾಂ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರು ಇಂದು ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ನೀತಿ ಯೇನೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think the Hon'ble Member is going at a tangent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He will do well not to cast any kind of aspersion against any member of this House in any sense.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದು ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿಯೂ ಧೈರ್ಯದ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ; ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನ್ಯೂನಾತಿಕ್ರಗಳಿವೆಯೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಬಲಪಡಿಸಬಹುದು, ಜನತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಗ್ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕುಡುಕತನವನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ರದ್ದುಮಾಡುವುದರ ಕೀಳು ದರ್ಜೆಯ ಜನರನ್ನು ಉತ್ತಮಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಹೊರತು ಎತ್ತೆ ಪುನಃ ಕುಡಿತ ಕಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಯನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City—South).—Sir, I listened with great attention to the plea put forward by Sri Imam. It shocked me a little when I found the Hon'ble Member putting forward a very forcible plea that the Government has to revise their prohibition policy. Sir, at one time, if I may recall to my mind his speeches on the floor of the former Legislative Council, he was a very good advocate of prohibition policy, though on his part he wanted the Government to be a bit halting.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I would like to quote one or two of my previous speeches.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in his report he advocated that Prohibition should be introduced by stages. Perhaps Government considered the Report in all its aspects and then thought that the introduction of prohibition in stages would not bring about the desired results and had to introduce prohibition at a stretch from district to district. My friend, Sri Imam, seems to have forgotten the directive principles of State policy as embodied in the Constitution. If

this Honourable House permits me to quote, I desire to quote article 47 of the Constitution :

“The State shall regard the raising of the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health as among its primary duties and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to bring about prohibition of the consumption except for medical purposes of intoxicating drinks and of drugs which are injurious to health.”

Sir, the representatives of this vast country that assembled in a Constituent Assembly have certainly taken note of the existing social conditions. I agree with him when he says that it is very difficult to bring about social changes early. It is equally true that we should not wait indefinitely for these social changes to take place. A step has to take place and the Government has taken the right step in accordance with the directive principles of State policy. The framers of the Constitution had in their mind the other aspect of the question, namely, that it is very difficult to bring about prohibition and that it would lead to the establishment of cottage industries, if I may say so, in the wake of the introduction of prohibition. I am not in the least worried if, as a result of prohibition and as a result of incompetence on our part to effectively check the manufacture of intoxicating drinks, some people manufacture this illicit liquor and drink themselves to death—it does not matter to me. What matters most to me is the social side of this question, whether Government would be a party to the opening of shops, for licensing shops with a view to get this tainted money. After all, in all humility I would submit to the House, who are the people who contribute most to the coffers of the State? It is the poor and the poorest of the poor that contribute this money. Therefore, in all sincerity I would plead with my friend first and then

with the supporters that he must consider this question in a more generous, sympathetic light and then see what would happen to millions of these dumb people who really contribute to the exchequer on this account. There is another aspect of the question. This policy was first initiated in Mysore many years ago. Experiment was tried in two taluks first. The results were considered. Then the step of extending it to other districts took place. After the achievement of freedom, it is true that the Government took long strides and introduced prohibition in about five districts.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—The tragedy of it is, before the Constitution was promulgated, prohibition was introduced in five districts. After the Constitution was promulgated, it has not been extended.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I am prepared to answer my friend. Let him bear with me for a few minutes more. It is true that Sri P. M. Swamidurai very fervently pleaded for the cancellation of prohibition in that particular area. K.G.F. is a very big area where the labour population is mostly concentrated. It is true that some of them may need drink; it is true that some of them may not realise the evil effect of drink, but it is up to the leaders of the public to say whether drink is an evil, whether it is a social evil which should be put down and should be put down effectively. Because we are not able to put it down effectively, it does not mean that we should license it and derive money that could be used for other purposes. It is not only now; I have been seeing the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition saying this often that we have lost very heavily on this account and that we could have undertaken more useful works if we had derived more money from drink. Whatever may be the force of that argument, I for one would not agree with him when he says that that money could be made use of for better purposes. The money, as I

(SRI T. MARIAPPA.)

already said, is drawn from the poorer section of the poor. If only we could make them see the evil in all its perspective and give it up altogether, it will be good; but my friend Sri Imam has not seen the good effects of this prohibition policy in the major portion of the State where it is introduced. I have seen a number of villages where we see smiling faces, where once we saw haggard looking and almost starving people. It is not an imaginative account I am giving. I am prepared to take him with me to some of the villages where our Harijan friends are living. I put a question to him direct whether his two friends here by his side, Sri M. Chikkalingaiya and B. Rachiah would agree with him. They have already said that it was not a party question and Sri Imam was speaking on his own behalf.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I said that we need not consider it as a party issue.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Therefore the representatives of those people who contributed most on this account are the best persons to plead either for its retention or cancellation. They would be the real representatives; they knew where the shoe pinches and therefore they would be the proper persons to plead for or against prohibition.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I object to this discrimination. He cannot dub the depressed classes as the people that are addicted to drink and other caste people as those who are not addicted to this habit.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—My friend is very uncharitable to them. I never dubbed them as those who drink.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—He has particularly drawn the attention of the House to the two members from the depressed class community. It means that; it is implied.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—My friend need not plead on their behalf. I

think they are best fitted and competent to plead for their own section. Therefore, they would be the best persons and I have heard year in and year out that the representatives of the scheduled castes have been pleading before Government for extending prohibition to other areas in the State and in fact on more than one occasion they have tabled a resolution and perhaps with the persuasion of the Government they have withdrawn these resolutions. It is true that there is some anomaly in Mysore State. While five districts are dry, the other four districts are wet. It is here that we have heeded to the voice of the Opposition. In fact, they wanted us to go slowly and cautiously and Government have gone cautiously. In response to the demand made by this House the year before last it was extended to two taluks—Belur and Saklespur. It is a matter on which we need not go into heated debate. It is really a social evil, and when it is recognised as a social evil, all of us must put our heads together to eradicate the social evil. Tinkering with the problem is no good. Piecemeal reforms will never bring about the desired results. I agree with him when he says: "At one stretch, if you had rendered the whole State dry I would have been the happiest man. Take the case of Bombay and Madras." It is true that they have introduced prohibition throughout their States, but Mysore could not afford to do so in the circumstances in which we are placed. Therefore, we are pursuing a cautious and slow policy, but that does not mean that we are advocating it in a halting manner. The Government perhaps is well aware of the financial situation and would certainly extend it to the other districts when the time is most opportune. When the evil is there and when the State recognises that it is an evil which should certainly be eradicated, when the directive principle of the State Policy is the introduction of prohibition with a view to raise the moral standard of

the population, I for one would see no reason whatever to agree to the plea put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

With these few words, I very sincerely appeal to my Hon'ble friend Sri P. M. Swamidurai. He comes from a very poor section of the population and he has to plead for their cause. It is true it may appeal to him that cancellation of prohibition may for the time being do some good to the K.G.F. area, but ultimately and in the long run it will certainly do most incalculable harm. With these few words I would certainly oppose the resolution moved by Sri Swamidurai.

2 P.M.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—Sir, while opposing the resolution brought by my friend Sri Swamidurai, I wish to bring to you notice that Sri Imam and other friends spoke in favour of the removal of prohibition. Hon'ble Sri Imam, a few years back was a Minister. He advocated gradual prohibition in the State. I do not know why in such a short time he has changed his opinion. Is it because that he is in the Opposition? Is it because that the present policy of Government is to extend prohibition and therefore Sri Imam opposes that move? I do not understand why in such a short time, he has changed his policy. Sri Mariappa opposed this resolution vehemently and he brought to our notice that there is a directive in the Constitution that prohibition will have to be introduced in all the States. When there is a directive, I do not know how we are entitled to discuss this subject, this resolution, on the floor of the House. Unless the Constitution is amended, it is not right that we should discuss on it. It is better, if we do not want prohibition, that the Constitution may be amended in the Parliament.

Sir, I live in a poor locality and I am surrounded by thousands of coolies and mill-workers and one or two fur-

longs from my house live hundreds of scavengers. These mill-workers get their salary on the 7th or 8th of every month and the scavengers on the 10th of every month. You have seen the Mysore Road. On that day, thousands of these scavengers and mill-workers will be excessively drunk and they will be lying on the road. At least half a dozen cases will be filed against drunkards. In every poor family of scavengers and mill-workers, at least, there will be four or five earning members, earning about Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 per month. I may tell you that on the 8th or 10th of the month, most of the money would have been spent on drinking. After two or three days, they will be almost starving. It is very pitiful to see that their wives and children—of scavengers and mill-workers—are thrown out in the streets without food and clothing. So is it not better that in the interests of the poorer class of people prohibition is introduced in the other districts as early as possible?

Hon'ble Sri Imam said that it is a social evil. He also admits it. If it is a social evil, why should it not be eradicated? He said that it can be done through propaganda and education. But I may assure him that unless there is some compulsion, it cannot be eradicated. Are not other social evils eradicated? For example, Varadakshina. In some States it is considered as a social evil and it has been almost prohibited. Not in our State but in other States. If it is an evil why should it not be prohibited? I feel that if we agree that it is a social evil, it also should be eradicated. Sri T. Mariappa said that this money is contributed by the poorer class of people. In a way it is an indirect tax. When all of us are pleading that the poor class of people should not be taxed either directly or indirectly, I do not know how we can recommend this indirect taxation.

Lastly, Sir, Sri Mariappa said that prohibition is not extended to other districts in Mysore State. I wish it

(SRI R. ANANTARAMAN.)

is extended. It would have been better if it is extended as early as possible to other districts, particularly to Bangalore City, where thousands of mill-workers and poorer class of people are suffering due to the non-introduction of prohibition. So, I oppose this resolution.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು-ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಸ್ವಾಮಿದೊರೆಯವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ದೊರೆಯವರು ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ನನಗೆ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಷಾದವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಾಬಿ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಂದ ಒಂದಲ್ಲ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಡವರು ಉದ್ಧಾರವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವದಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ಅರ್ಧ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂ ಸಾಹೇಬರು, ಈಗ ಮನೆ ಮನೆಗೂ ಅಂಗಡಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು challenge ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾರು ಕುಡಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಆದರೆ ಯಾರು ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಣ ಗಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ಕಳ್ಳಭಟ್ಟ ಸಾರಾಯಿ ಇಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅನೇಕರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳ್ಳತನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತು, ಅದರೂ ಕಳ್ಳತನ ನಿಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯೂ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಒರೋ ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆ ಸಾರಾಯಿ ಕಳ್ಳಭಟ್ಟ ಅದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ವಿನಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೂ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಪಡಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಡಸಂಸಾರಿಗಳು ತೊಂದರೆಗೀಡಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಕಳ್ಳಭಟ್ಟೆಯಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಕೆಟ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ—ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಅಂಥ ಕಳ್ಳತನದಿಂದ ಕಳ್ಳಭಟ್ಟೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಖಾಯಿರೆ ಬಂದು ಅವರು ಸತ್ತುಹೋದರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಕಳ್ಳತನ ಮಾಡುವವರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದುಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು: ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬಡವರಿಂದಲೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಈ ಹಣ ಬರುವುದು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿರುವ ಮತ್ತು ಬಡವರಾಗಿರುವ ಜನರಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕುಡಿತದಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಬಡವರೂ, ಬಡಸಂಸಾರಿಗಳೂ ಅನಂದಮಯವಾಗಿ ನುಬಮಯವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಈಗ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವವರು ಯಾರು? ಕುಡಿಯುವ ಜನರು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri P. R. RAMAIIYA (Basavanagudi).—A resolution of this type seems to be a hardy-annual. In every session of the Assembly we find such a resolution being moved and the Opposition members, whenever an opportunity arises either during the budget discussion or during other times, harp upon this subject that prohibition should be abolished. Sir, the arguments they advance in favour of their proposition are mainly two. One is that there is illicit distillation in the places where prohibition is introduced and the other argument is that financially Government will be benefited if prohibition is abolished. Both these arguments seem to be very hollow because, the policy of the Government is to put down illicit distillation. If the Government have not been successful in that policy, it is due to the causes beyond their control. Unless the people in the localities fully co-operate with the Government that prohibition should be made a success, the Government machinery alone—however big the police battalion may be—will not be able to stamp out drink evil in those areas. Therefore, my appeal to the people of the localities where prohibition is introduced is that they should make more earnest and vigorous efforts than now to see that illicit distillation is stamped out. People who argue that people addicted to drink may be induced to give up drink by persuasion can do that work much easier by approaching the people who are indulging in illicit distillation.

Sir, it is said that there is illicit distillation, but that is no reason why prohibition should be scrapped. Perhaps the Government will have to take more stringent steps to put down illicit distillation. I would like our Opposition members to impress upon the Government the necessity of enforcing prohibition in a more stringent manner in the areas where it is in force.

The other argument is that Government will get funds for public utility activities and for nation building activities by scrapping prohibition. This is a very curious argument. It is trying to divide the people from the Government. Who are the people and who are the Government? The people and the Government are one in this democratic age. If the people who are addicted to drink are benefited by the policy of prohibition, it is beneficial not only to the people but also to the Government. Suppose you scrap prohibition in the areas in which it has been in vogue now, what happens? The people who had stopped drinking in these areas will go back to drink. What happens? Those people will get poorer and their families will suffer intensively. If so, who is going to help the families that will suffer like that? Then perhaps the Government will have to come to their aid. It is curious to argue that if prohibition is scrapped the Government will be benefited and they will be getting more funds.

After all, the duty of the Government is to help people in distress. Prohibition is a preventive measure. Before people get into distress, it is the duty of the Government to see that they do not get into distress. Therefore this prohibition is very beneficial measure. Now there is another argument—perhaps it is advanced by the Opposition on this ground that in all the States in India prohibition is not introduced and so it is not an All-India policy. A few days ago, Pandit Nehru, Prime

Minister, in a statement to some magazine said that :

“We have full faith in the policy of prohibition. If the States where it is not introduced have not introduced it yet, they may take time but it does not mean that the areas where prohibition has been introduced should go back and scrap it.”

Therefore we should have a progressive policy in this direction. The Hon'ble Member, Sri T. Mariappa, alluded to some of the efforts made in this connection by Sri Mohamed Imam, the Leader of the Opposition. It appears he had advanced the cause of gradual prohibition. Now what the Government have undertaken is, they have introduced prohibition in five districts and in other districts they have to introduce prohibition. It is our duty to strengthen the hands of the Government to see that prohibition is introduced in other areas also. Speaking of Bangalore, I may say that I come in contact with the people who dwell in slum areas. In Basavangudi, in Narasimharaja Colony and in the eastern portion, I find people dwelling in slum areas. I very often have advised them to give up drinks. Most of these stone cutters earn four rupees per day and spend two rupees on drink. It is a tragic factor. If prohibition had been introduced they would have saved two rupees. I ascertained from them their view. They want prohibition to be introduced in Bangalore City. Therefore I would like the Government to pursue a progressive policy in this direction and see that as the next immediate step they introduce prohibition in the City of Bangalore.

Mr. **SPEAKER**.—The Hon'ble Minister may reply.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government and Public Health).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, my friends Sriyuths Swamidurai, Mohamed Imam and Sydney Thomas have urged for repeal of prohibition. They said that the scheme is a failure and

(Sri T. CHANNIAH.)

should be scrapped forthwith in the broader interests of the State finance. This subject had come up for discussion on several occasions on the floor of this House and elsewhere. The policy that is being followed by the Government has been made clear by me. It is true that this is a very controversial subject. It has been pointed out by some members that prohibition has corrupted public life. As my friend Sri T. Mariappa and some others have pointed out, Government are committed to the policy of prohibition. They have a duty to carry out the mandate prescribed by the Constitution and I wish to assure the House that we will not lose sight of the directive of the State Policy as laid down in the Constitution. Government have been following a cautious policy. They are of the view that any extension of prohibition to other parts of the State should be consistent with the national economy. It is estimated that if prohibition is introduced in all the Districts, Government will lose revenue to the tune of about Rs. 2 crores and 20 lakhs.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—If you abolish prohibition, what will be the enhanced revenue?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—There is no question of this. Government cannot afford to lose this substantial income.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli-Gudibanda).—Why this dual personality? A person who drinks in one place is a criminal and a person who drinks in another place is a gentleman like Jekyll and Hyde?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—We cannot afford to lose this revenue in view of the urgent need to augment our resources to meet the growing expenditure consequent on the implementation of the Five-Year Plan and the expansion of the Welfare activities, as my friend Sri Swamidurai has pointed out.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—Open up shops and get some money.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—As I have said, Government cannot go back nor lose sight of the directive of the State policy as laid down in the Constitution.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—Does the Hon'ble Minister know that Justice Wanchoo has recommended the removal of prohibition in the Andhra State?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—That is why we have been following a cautious policy. Prohibition can be a success if only the public whole-heartedly co-operated with the Government in the working of the scheme. As you are aware, special prohibition staff has been appointed to detect cases of illicit distillation, etc. The public is expected to assist the prohibition police in the detection of illicit distillation cases and to see that the evil is minimised. And prohibition can easily be a success when a proper psychological atmosphere is created. Government are trying to create such an atmosphere. Some slight adjustments in the dry areas will have to be effected to secure compact dry areas instead of having areas scattered here and there.

The working of prohibition in the five districts of Tumkur, Kolar, Chitaldrug, Chikmagalur and Shimoga and the taluks of Belur, Saklespur, Ramanagaram and Channapatna is being watched. There has been a substantial increase in the number of prohibition cases detected. Detection of a large number of cases is due to stricter vigilance on the part of the prohibition staff. The working of the prohibition department has been satisfactory. Government cannot be accused of failure to take steps to check illicit distillation.

2-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರಾಜ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು adjustments ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು: ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—That is a matter for future consideration.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—How long does it take?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—We are thinking of amending the Prohibition Act on the lines of the Bombay Act to enable our Courts to award deterrent punishment in illicit distillation cases, etc.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—There is no partial prohibition in Bombay.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Total prohibition.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—So you cannot enforce it here.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Punishments that are at present awarded by our courts are somewhat lenient. As I said, we are contemplating certain amendments to the Prohibition Act somewhat on the lines of the Bombay Act, so that deterrent punishment is provided for certain types of prohibition offences. The Courts will also be empowered to award more from the fine imposed as rewards to informants and police officers who are responsible for detection of the cases.

Before extending prohibition to other parts of the State, it is necessary to assess the results so far achieved in the dry districts. The question was under the consideration of Government. But as the Government of India are likely to take up this question, it was considered not desirable for each state to pursue the question individually.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think the Government of India have not yet constituted the Committee.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—I think so. The Government of India will be addressed in the matter. Government are of the view that the extension of prohibition should be consistent with the national economy. It will not be possible for the State to extend prohibition to other parts of the State; but it is proposed to make certain adjustments in the areas where prohibition is in force to meet certain local problems. Some of my friends said that on account of illicit distillation on a large scale in rural areas, even women and children have

become drink addicts. If only the public whole-heartedly co-operate with Government in the detection of those cases, it is possible to minimise this evil. I would therefore appeal to the Movers of the Resolution also to whole-heartedly co-operate with Government in the detection of illicit distillation cases and to bring to their notice.....

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In what form? You want us to visit house to house?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—If such things come to their notice, they may duly inform the prohibition police so that they may conduct necessary enquiries and bring the offenders to book.

Sri P. M. SWAMIDURAI.—I press the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“This Assembly is of the opinion that Prohibition should be repealed and the amount obtained by removal of Prohibition may be utilised for the betterment of the State.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In a way we have now disposed of nine resolutions by this single resolution, viz., Nos. 15, 25, 35, 37 and 38 as well as Resolutions Nos. 24, 39, 47 and 113.

The next resolution stands in the name of Sri R. Muniswamiah. He is not present. Next Resolution No. 17 by Sri P. R. Ramaiya.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—Sir, I do not propose to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution No. 18. Sri L. Siddappa is not present. No. 19 by Sri Kemparaj.

No. 19. Fixing a ceiling limit to Lands in possession of Absentee Landlords.

Sri B. T. KEMPA RAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—I beg to move :

“This Assembly is of the opinion that an absentee landlord may be allowed to possess